



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,578	11/17/2003	Ajay Sarkar	028108-0203	4734
30542	7590	01/26/2005	EXAMINER	
FOLEY & LARDNER P.O. BOX 80278 SAN DIEGO, CA 92138-0278			DINH, KHANH Q	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2151	

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/715,578

Applicant(s)

SARKAR, AJAY

Examiner

Khanh Dinh

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE \_\_\_\_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/28/2003.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2151

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-16 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jennings III et al., US pat. No.6,772,225.

As to claim 1, Jennings discloses a method for web services policy management, comprising:

providing a set of policies in a policy dataset (establishing a policy rule) in a web services system (Policy repository server 201 fig.2), said policy dataset adapted to be accessed by applications in said web services system, said policies being associated with user-defined classes and user-defined levels (defining matching condition associated with classes, see fig.2, abstract, col.3 lines 22-52);

updating one or more policies in said policy dataset to provide an updated policy dataset (determining if the policy is current) and accessing said updated policy

dataset by an immediately subsequent activity of said applications (see fig.5, col.3 line 53 to col.4 line 53 and col.5 lines 1-33).

As to claims 2 and 3, Jennings discloses wherein said step of updating is implemented through a graphical user interface and including at least one of a change, an addition and a deletion associated with a predefined set of classes and or levels of policies (see fig.3, col.3 lines 1-53 and col.5 lines 34-53).

As to claims 4 and 5, Jennings discloses the policy dataset is implemented in a database (caches of the repository server) and is accessible by an administrator with rights to perform said step of updating (see col.3 lines 23-58 and col.5 lines 1-53).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 6-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jennings III et al., US pat. No.6,772,225 in view of Shah et al., US pat. No.6,678,835.

Art Unit: 2151

As to claim 6, Jennings discloses a method for web services policy management, comprising:

detecting of a change, addition or deletion in one or more policies in a web services system (Policy repository server 201 fig.2), said policies being in a database (cache), said database being configurable to associate policies with user-defined classes and user-defined levels (defining matching condition associated with classes, see fig.2, abstract, col.3 lines 22-52);

uploading in run-time at least said one or more policies for application to subsequent activities within said web services system and wherein said change, addition or deletion may be associated with a predefined set of classes and or levels of policies (determining if the browser should go to a specific cache, see fig.5, col.3 line 53 to col.4 line 53 and col.5 lines 1-33).

Jennings does not specifically disclose flag indicative for a change. However, Shah discloses flag indicative for a change (using an action flag attribute 730 indicates whether traffic is to be allowed or denied for the indicated policy). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Shah's teachings into the computer system of Jennings to manage web policy because it would have enabled users/administrators to manage network services and policies for their organization and needed not to duplicate the updated information already stored in the database.

Art Unit: 2151

As to claims 7 and 8, Jennings discloses that said change, addition or deletion is implemented through a graphical user interface, addition or deletion in a policy in any class at any level (see fig.3, col.3 lines 1-53 and col.5 lines 34-53). Jennings does not specifically disclose flag indicative for a change. However, Shah discloses flag indicative for a change (using an action flag attribute 730 indicates whether traffic is to be allowed or denied for the indicated policy). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Shah's teachings into the computer system of Jennings to manage web policy because it would have enabled users/administrators to manage network services and policies for their organization and needed not to duplicate the updated information already stored in the database.

As to claims 9 and 10, Shah discloses that the flag is a one-bit element and a multi-bit checksum (see col.17 lines 11-59 and col.18 lines 18-64). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Shah's teachings into the computer system of Jennings to manage web policy because it would have enabled users/administrators to manage network services and policies for their organization and needed not to duplicate the updated information already stored in the database.

Art Unit: 2151

As to claims 11 and 12, Jennings discloses said uploading includes uploading the entire policy database uploading only changed, added or deleted policy sets (see col.3 lines 23-58 and col.5 lines 1-53).

As to claims 13 and 14, Shah discloses a second flag associated with all policy classes at a single level and a second flag associated with a single policy class at all levels (see col.3 lines 1-53, col.17 lines 11-59 and col.18 lines 18-64). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Shah's teachings into the computer system of Jennings to manage web policy because it would have enabled users/administrators to manage network services and policies for their organization and needed not to duplicate the updated information already stored in the database.

As to claims 15 and 16, Shah discloses a second flag associated with one or more policy classes at one or more single level and a second flag associated with one or more policy classes at one or more single level (see col.3 lines 1-53, col.17 lines 11-59 and col.18 lines 18-64). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Shah's teachings into the computer system of Jennings to manage web policy because it would have enabled users/administrators to manage network services and policies for their organization and needed not to duplicate the updated information already stored in the database.

***Other prior art cited***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Arlitt et al, US pat. No.6,272,598.
- b. Colby et al, US pat. No. 6,449,647.
- c. Allard et al, US pat. No.6,067,559.

***Conclusion***

7. Claims 1-16 are rejected.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-3936. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 5:00 P.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung, can be reached on (703) 272-3939. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

*A shortened statutory period for reply is set to expire THREE months from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (35 U. S. C . Sect.133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(A).*

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval IPAIRI system. Status information for published



Art Unit: 2151

applications may be obtained from either Private PMR or Public PMR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Khanh Dinh  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2151  
1/23/2005

---